



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

TRANSACTIONS  
OF THE  
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION  
1908

---

I—*On the Use of the Dactyl after an Initial Trochee in  
Greek Lyric Verse*

BY PROF. EDWARD H. SPIEKER  
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

IN the well-known passage of the *Frogs*, 1309 ff., in which Aristophanes makes Aeschylus present a sample of Euripides' style in the composition of lyrics, there occurs a line which at first sight seems to be an ordinary logaoedic line, and which, except for the fact that it may be regarded as having either four feet or five feet, is not likely to attract attention. The line in question is 1313, and it reads as follows:—

*αἱ θ' ὑπωρόφιοι κατὰ γωνίας* — υ | ~ υ | ~ υ | ~ υ |.

An examination of the following passage, which holds up to ridicule Euripides' treatment of monodies, reveals the fact that we have similar metrical conditions, with the addition of anacrusis, in line 1361:—

*σὺ δ', ὦ Διός, διπύρους ἀνέχουσα* υ : — υ | ~ υ | ~ υ | — υ |.

Did Aristophanes, in writing these lines, have in mind only a general parody of Euripides' style, or was he thinking of the metre as well? In an effort to get a satisfactory answer to this question I was led to make a full examination of the use of the dactyl after an initial trochee, and the results of this study are offered in the following paper.

In the history of Greek versification there is no more interesting condition than that which is presented in the twofold assimilation and union of the four-time and the three-time elements; of the tetraseme and the triseme; or, to take the representative feet themselves, of the dactyl and the trochee. In literature it is the four-time element which we meet first, and it shares honors with the other tetraseme, the spondee. Some time elapses before we meet the triseme, the trochee, and the iamb, although it must have been familiar to the people for a long time before Archilochus gave it the stamp of his approval. Then came the union of these two differing elements, and this union took place in two ways. In the one the dignity of the tetraseme is retained and the trochee is admitted to equal rights with the dactyl and the spondee; this gives us the dactylo-epitrite, so much used by Pindar; in the other the dactyl is made lighter, so as to adapt it to the triseme, and we thus get the familiar logaoedic forms of verse.

This union of the dactyl and the trochee was not made without some limitation to the use of the irrational element: for the dactylo-epitrite there must regularly be a spondee accompanying the trochee; in logaoedic verse there is at first a well-defined preference for the use of only one dactyl. Certain it is that the monodactylic logaoedic lines are among the most extensively used in Greek poetry, especially the four-foot line, the so-called Glyconic, and the three-foot line, the Pherecratean. The two-foot Adonic is too short to assure it a very extended use, although Sappho and Horace have made it very familiar to the modern reader. The three five-foot lines, the Sapphic, the Alcaic, and the Phalaecean, complete the series.

The extreme simplicity and beauty of these verses must appeal at once to every one. Nothing could be more beautifully regular in its simplicity than the Sapphic verse, with its central dactyl flanked by two trochees (with occasional spondee) on either side, and the same may be said of the Alcaic, which differs from the Sapphic only in the shifting of the syllable at the end to the anacrustic position at the begin-

ning. One is reminded of the simplicity and regularity which we meet elsewhere in Greek art, especially in architecture; it is, in fact, typically Greek. Compare now with this the epichoriambic explanation of the Sapphic given by Hephaestion, — ∪ — ∪ | — ∪ ∪ — | ∪ — —, and the antispastic explanation of the other monodactylic lines, including the other five-foot line, the Phalaecean (each line being supposed to begin with an antispast, ∪ — — ∪, with a generous range of substitutions allowed in the first foot). Next to the inherent improbability that the Greeks would have allowed so grotesque a combination as a fundamental element in their verse, this very simplicity and beauty of the lines, when regarded as logaoedic, is the most cogent argument conceivable against the whole doctrine of the antispast. It must have had its birth in the effort to account for the nerve-racking dochmiac, and to find some general category in which it might be placed.

But if this tendency to use only one dactyl in logaoedic lines was the original use, the number of dactyls allowed certainly increased very soon; so much so, in fact, that at times the dactyl dominates the verse. There seems, however, to have been at all times one restriction to this free use of the dactyl. After an initial trochee, alone or with anacrusis, in Greek lyric verse there seems to have been a definite avoidance of the use of more than one dactyl in the kolon. The exceptions to this tendency are the following familiar types:—

(1) Aeolic dactylic lines in which a trochee is used in the first foot. This is only one phase of the free treatment of the initial foot in these lines. (This free use of ordinarily incompatible elements at the opening of a line may have led the Greek writers on metrics to adopt the antispast as a basic element in the composition of Greek verse.) Aeolic influence is evident in Simonides Ceius,

1, 9: κόσμον ἀέναόν τε κλέος — ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — ∧ |,

and

46: ἔσχατον δύεται κατὰ γᾶς — ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — ∧ |.

Both of these are similar to the lines of Aristophanes cited above. The same influence is probable in Pind. *Pyth.* 11, 1: Κάδμου κόραι, Σεμέλα μὲν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀγνιάτις; perhaps, too, in Telestes, 3, 4: χεῖρα καμψιδίαυλον ἀναστρωφῶν τάχος. If Bergk's reading of Simonides Ceius, 22, 5, εἰπέ τ' ὦ τέκος, οἶον ἔχω πόνον — ∪ | ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ |, were right, this would be another example.

(2) Dactylo-epitrite lines opening with the epitrite. Probably the original use involved a separation into more than one kolon. The familiar type, — ∪ | — — | — ∪ ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — ∧ |, is found in logaoedic verse also. This logaoedic adaptation of Doric material is found in the lyric poets and in the dramatists. Of the latter, Euripides uses it most, Aeschylus not at all. Pindar naturally uses it rarely, the regular Doric use being so largely represented in his odes; still, we find, *Ol.* 13, 18 (second line of the epode): ταῖ Διωνύσου πόθεν ἐξέφανε — ∪ | — > || ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ | — ∧ |.

(3) Lines beginning with a cretic, or with a trochee and a choriamb, often show more than one dactyl. In many cases such lines are clearly to be divided into two or more kola. Editors are frequently not in accord as to the division. Whenever such lines cannot be divided, it is probable that the allowance of more than one dactyl was due to an extension of the original use, in which the dactyls were in different kola. An initial cretic is itself often followed by one or more choriamb, *e.g.*: —

Soph. *Ant.* 783: φοιτᾷς ὑπερπόντιος ἔν τ' ἀγρονόμοις αὐλαῖς  
> : — ∪ | ∪ || ∪ ∪ | ∪ | ∪ ∪ | ∪ | ∪ | — ∧ |.

Aristoph. *Cl.* 950: νῦν δείξετον τῷ πυσύνω τοῖς περιδεξίοισι  
> : — ∪ | ∪ || ∪ ∪ | ∪ | ∪ ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ |.

An interesting case of this type is found in Aesch. *Suppl.* 60. Here Schmidt reads, δοξάσει τιν' ἀκούειν ὅπα τᾶς; Dindorf, δοξάσει τιν' ἀκούειν ὅπα τᾶς Τηρείας. Schmidt's arrangement certainly offers a strikingly regular combination: three choriamb; four trochaic feet; trochee + two choriamb (the line in question); three choriamb; four trochaic feet.

A line like Pind. *Pyth.* 7, 17 (the last of the epode), *θάλλουσαν εὐδαιμονίαν τὰ καὶ τὰ φέρεσθαι*, is scanned by Schmidt as an hexapody, > : — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ |; Schneidewin divides into two separate lines. Assuming that it is one line, we may perhaps get the right conception by studying a type like *Pyth.* 2, 21 :—

*θεῶν δ' ἐφετμαῖς Ἰξίονα φαντὶ ταῦτα βροτοῖς* ∪ : — ∪ | — ∪ || > |  
— ∪ ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — ∪ || — ∪ | — ∪ ∪ |.

Here there can be no doubt that the first or the last cretic must be separated from the rest; perhaps both, as the line is scanned by Gildersleeve.

The exceptional use of two dactyls in several Phalaecean lines of the skolia only serves to call attention to the rule, for these lines have only one dactyl, except where the necessity of using the names Harmodios and Aristogeiton causes the irregularity. The lines containing two dactyls are :—

7, 2 : ὥσπερ Ἀρμόδιος καὶ Ἀριστογείτων.

The line is repeated in 9, 2.

10, 2 : φίλταθ' Ἀρμόδιος καὶ Ἀριστογείτων.

In addition to the three typical exceptions given above there are some sporadic exceptions to the rule, and these we shall now consider. Here again we must observe that editors do not always agree as to the proper arrangement of the lines, so that one text may present an example which is not to be found in others. In such cases we may at least be in doubt, unless there are cogent reasons for accepting a line which gives us more than one dactyl after an initial trochee. So, *e.g.*, Schmidt reads, Soph. *Oed. Col.* 237 : ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ γεραὸν πατέρα — ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — ∪ ∪ |, the arrangement being different in other texts. In view of the fact that Sophocles has no undoubted example of a similar violation of the rule, it is only fair to assume that Schmidt is wrong in his arrangement of the lines. So, too, he reads in the *Antigone*, 1149 : παῖ Διὸς γένεθλον προφάνηθ', with the scansion — ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — ∪ ∪ |. Here again the arrangement is not certain; but even

if we accept Schmidt's line, it is clearly better to take the reading  $\Delta\iota\omicron\nu$  proposed by Seyffert, or  $\text{Ζηνός}$ , suggested by Bothe.

In Euripides there are two lines which seem to be certain. They are: *Electra*, 439,  $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\phi\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\lambda\mu\alpha \pi\omicron\delta\omega\upsilon\nu \text{'}\chi\iota\lambda\eta \text{---}\cup | \sim\cup | \sim\cup | \text{---}\wedge |$ , and *ib.* 449,  $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omicron\tau\alpha\varsigma \tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\nu \text{'}\epsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota \phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma \text{---}\cup | \sim\cup | \sim\cup | \text{---}\wedge |$ . These two examples make some of the following possible, especially the first two; all of them, however, are doubtful.

*Herc. Fur.* 889, Schmidt reads:  $\acute{\omega}\mu\acute{o}\beta\rho\omega\tau\epsilon\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\iota\nu\acute{o}\delta\iota\kappa\omicron\iota$ , and scans  $\text{---}\cup | \sim\cup | \sim\cup | \text{---}\wedge |$ . Other texts differ. Even if we adopt Schmidt's reading, the initial foot may be regarded as a spondee.

*Iph. Aul.* 791,  $\rho\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha \delta\alpha\kappa\rho\nu\acute{o}\epsilon\nu \tau\alpha\nu\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ , Schmidt scans  $\text{---}\cup | \sim\cup | \sim\cup | \text{---}\wedge |$ , but it is equally possible to scan the second foot as a tribrach. The preceding line makes this all the more probable. There we have:  $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha \mu' \epsilon\upsilon\pi\lambda\omicron\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \kappa\acute{o}\mu\alpha\varsigma \cup\cup\cup | \sim\cup | \text{---}\cup | \text{---}\wedge |$ . Such shifting in the relative position of the same feet in successive lines is not unfamiliar.

*Herc. Fur.* 895:  $\beta\omicron\tau\rho\acute{\upsilon}\omega\nu \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota} \chi\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\varsigma\iota \lambda\omicron\iota\beta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ ; Schmidt scans  $\text{---}\cup | \sim\cup | \sim\cup | \text{---}\cup |$ , but it is more likely that the scansion  $\cup\cup : \sim\cup | \sim\cup | \text{---}\cup | \text{---}\wedge |$  is right.

*Ib.* 908, Schmidt reads:  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\pi' \text{'}\epsilon\gamma\kappa\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha \pi\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon} \Pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma, \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \delta\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu\varsigma \pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\epsilon\iota\varsigma \text{---}\cup | \sim\cup | \sim\cup | \text{---}> || \text{---}\cup | \text{---}\cup | \text{---}\wedge |$ . Nauck puts  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  on the preceding line. But in all probability Schmidt is right. The line would thus be like Pindar, *Pyth.* 11, 1, cited above (page 8).

*Iph. Taur.* 845,  $\acute{\omega} \text{Κυκλωπίδες} \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota, \acute{\omega} \pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ , Schmidt scans  $\text{---}\cup | \sim\cup | \sim\cup | \text{---}\cup | \text{---}\wedge |$ , thus making a pentapody. The line is in a komma between two dochmiacs, and as Euripides not infrequently has pentapodies in this position, Schmidt is probably right; it is possible, however, to assume a pause before  $\acute{\omega} \pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ , followed as it is by  $\text{Μυκήνα φίλα}$ .

*Ion*, 231,  $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega \mu\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha \cdot \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \delta\acute{\epsilon} \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$ , Schmidt scans  $\cup : \text{---}\cup | \sim\cup | \sim\cup | \text{---}\wedge |$ . Here Nauck puts the second half on the following line. If we accept Schmidt's reading, it is more likely that  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  is to be scanned as one syllable.

*Orestes*, 1465, ἃ δ' ἀνίαχεν, ἴαχεν, ὥμοι μοι, is scanned by Schmidt  $\_ \cup | \sim \cup | \sim \cup | \_ > | \_ \wedge |$ , making the initial  $\iota$  of the verb long by augment. As Homer allows both the long and the short vowel in this tense of the verb (cf. *Il.* xvii, 317 and xviii, 29), and as the next verb in the Euripidean passage omits the augment, we are justified in saying that Euripides probably meant to use the short vowel in the first verb. That he had in mind the long vowel for the second verb, thus alternating the quantities, is made likely by the other pentapody of the komma: φυγᾶ δὲ ποδὶ τὸ χρυσεοσάνδαλον  $\cup : \_ \cup | \cup \cup \cup | \sim \cup | \_ \cup | \_ \wedge |$ .

*Phoen.* 128, γίγαντι γηγενέτα προσόμοιος  $\cup : \_ \cup | \sim \cup | \sim \cup | \_ \cup |$ . Here Seidler reads: γίγαντί τε γηγενέτα προσόμοιος, and Nauck comments: "an γίγαντι delendum?"

In Pindar we find six undoubted instances, four occurring in the same ode, each being the same line of the epode (practically one example); the other two are from the fragments. They are the following:—

*Ol.* 9, 29, 59, 89, 119 (each example is the seventh line of the epode). Line 29 reads: ἐξαίρετον Χαρίτων νέμομαι κᾶπον,  $> : \_ \cup | \sim \cup | \sim \cup | \_ \cup | \_ \cup |$ .

*Fragm., Prosodia*, 3, 3, λίσσομαι Χαρίτεσσίν τε καὶ σὺν Ἀφροδίτᾳ  $\_ \cup | \sim \cup | \sim \cup | \_ \cup | \_ \cup | \_ \cup |$ .

*Fragm., ἐξ ἀδ. εἰδῶν*, 22, δενδρέων δὲ νόμον Διόνυσος πολυγαθῆς αὐξάνου  $\_ \cup | \sim \cup | \sim \cup | \_ \cup | \sim \cup | \_ > | \_ \cup | \_ \wedge |$ . This line unquestionably shows the influence of the familiar Doric type.

The other examples in Pindar are more or less doubtful. Many seeming examples are clearly to be divided, e.g., lines 3–5 of the strophe in *Ol.* 9, which are made up each of a Glyconic + an Adonic. Line 3 reads: ἄρκεσε Κρόνιον παρ' ὄχθον ἀγεμονεύσαι  $\_ \cup | \sim \cup | \_ \cup | \_ \cup | \sim \cup | \_ \cup |$ . Similar conditions are found in *Nem.* 4, 1 and *Isthm.* 7, 8 (eighth line of the strophe). *Nem.* 4, 1 reads: ἄριστος εὐφροσύνα πόνων κεκριμένον,  $\cup : \_ \cup | \sim \cup | \_ \cup | \_ \cup | \sim \cup | \_ \wedge |$ . *Isthm.* 7, 8: μήτ' ἐν ὀρφανίᾳ πέσωμεν στεφάνων  $\_ \cup | \sim \cup | \_ \cup | \_ \cup | \sim \cup | \_ \wedge |$ .

*Pyth.* 2, 6 (sixth line of the strophe): τηλαυγέσιν ἀνέδησεν



Ὀρτυγίαν στεφάνοις >: — ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ | — ∪ || — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ |. This may be an hexapody, but is much more easily taken as two tripodies.

*Pyth.* 7, 13 (first line of the epode), ὦ Μεγάκλεες, ὑμαί τε καὶ προγόνων — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ || — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ |. This is correctly divided by Gildersleeve into two tripodies, but Schmidt scans as an hexapody.

*Nem.* 3, 19 (third line of the epode), εἰ δ' ἐὼν καλὸς ἔρδων τ' εὐκότα μορφῇ — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ || — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ |. This is divided by Schmidt.

Still plainer is the division in *Isthm.* 7, 6 (sixth line of the strophe), θυμόν, αἰτέομαι χρυσέαν καλέσαι — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ || — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ |. Everything in this case points to a division of the line; yet Schmidt scans it as an hexapody.

*Fragm. Dith.* 3, 14, εὐδομον ἐπαῖωσιν ἔαρ φυτὰ νεκτάρεια >: — ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ || — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ |. Similar to this is *Fragm. Hyborch.* 3, 2, ἐπὶ θηρσὶ κύνα τρέφειν πυκινώτατον ἐρπετόν ∪ ∪: — ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ || — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ |.

*Fragm.*, ἐξ ἀδ. εἰδῶν, 13, κατεκρίθη δὲ θνατοῖς ἀγανώτατος ἔμμεν, ∪: — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ || — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ |; 24, 2, σοί τε, καρτεροβρόντα Κρονίδα, φίλος δὲ Μοίσαις, — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ || — ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ |.

In Aristophanes himself, if we do not count the two lines from the *Frogs* cited above, there are no exceptions to the rule.

Summing up, then, we find that with the exception of the three types mentioned (two of which in their origin were probably not exceptions) there are comparatively few lines in Greek lyric poetry in which an initial trochee is followed within the kolon by more than one dactyl, and that they are found in Pindar and Euripides, and in Simonides, if we count the two examples quoted from him. All of them may have been due to either Aeolic or Doric influence. In view of these facts it is altogether reasonable to suppose that Aristophanes had in mind the metre also when he wrote the two lines of the *Frogs*. Perhaps he knew of more such lines in Euripides than we do, but it is hardly probable that there were many.

It may be added that if the initial foot is a spondee, or a dactyl, or even a tribrach, there is no such limitation as we have tried to show for the trochee; *e.g.*, —

Eur. *Hipp.* 164, ὠδίνων τε καὶ ἀφροσύνας — > | ~ ~ | ~ ~ |  
— ^ |.

*Orestes*, 1369, Ἀργεῖον ξίφος ἐκ θανάτου πέφενγα — > |  
~ ~ | ~ ~ | — ~ | — ^ |.

*Iph. Taur.* 1106, ὦ πολλαὶ δακρύων λιβάδες — > | ~ ~ |  
~ ~ | — ^ |.

*Ib.* 1092, εὐξύνετον ξυνετοῖσι βοάν ~ ~ | ~ ~ | ~ ~ |  
— ^ |.

*Med.* 432, μαινομένα καρδιά, διδύμας ὀρίσασα πόντου  
~ ~ | ~ ~ | ~ ~ || ~ ~ | — ~ | — ^ |.

*Iph. Aul.* 180, Πάρις ὁ βουκόλος ἂν ἔλαβε ~ ~ ~ | ~ ~ |  
~ ~ | — ^ |.

*Ib.* 1087, παρὰ δὲ ματέρι νυμφοκόμον ~ ~ ~ | ~ ~ |  
~ ~ | — ^ |.